



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,847	03/03/2004	Youenn Fablet	01807.101570.	2498

5514 7590 10/29/2007
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

ZAHR, ASHRAF A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

4135

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/29/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/790,847

Applicant(s)

FABLET, YOUENN

Examiner

Ashraf Zahr

Art Unit

4135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/18/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 4135

DETAILED ACTION

1. The application was filed on 3/3/2004 and the information disclosure statement (IDS) was filed on 6/18/2004. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statement.
2. Claims 1-24 are pending in the case.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 4135

5. Claims ~~1-24~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lonroth et al., US 6,826,597 (Hereinafter, Lonroth).

Regarding Claim 1, Lonroth discloses a “method of offering a service provided by a server computer in a communication network”. Specifically, Lonroth discloses a method and system for allowing an arbitrary client to be serviced by a single application is described (Lonroth, col 3, ln 49-51).

Lonroth also discloses a “comprising a step of sending a document describing a service”. Specifically, a client sends a request to pre-processor (Lonroth, col 4, ln 30).

Lonroth also discloses a “comprising a description of a functionality implemented during a preprocessing or post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of said service on the communication network”. Specifically, each service request identifies the service that is requested, and may include any number of parameter values associated with the request (Lonroth, col 4 , ln 32-36).

Regarding Claim 2, Lonroth discloses a “method of offering a service according to Claim 1, wherein said functionality defines processings adapted to produce or use data in XML format defined in a first abstract part of a service description document”. Specifically, those request objects take the form of XML documents (Lonroth, col 4 , ln 10-15).

Regarding Claim 3, Lonnroth discloses a “method of offering a service according to Claim 2, wherein the description of said functionality is inserted in said first abstract part of the service description document”. Specifically, the metadata may contain data that identifies the particular client that issued a request, the device type of the client, the protocol supported by that client, the user currently using the client, the service requested by the client, and various parameters associated with the requested service (Lonnroth, col 9, ln 32-37).

Regarding Claim 4, Lonnroth discloses a “method of offering a service according to Claim 1, wherein said preprocessing or said post-processing is implemented via a script language”. Specifically, post processor has an XSL engine (Lonnroth, col 7, ln 40-50).

Regarding Claim 5, Lonnroth discloses a “method of offering a service according to Claim 1, wherein said functionality is defined as a data item in XML format in a first abstract part of a service description document”. Specifically, the metadata may contain data that identifies the particular client that issued a request, the device type of the client, the protocol supported by that client, the user currently using the client, the service requested by the client, and various parameters associated with the requested service (Lonnroth, col 9, ln 32-37).

Regarding Claim 6, Lonnroth discloses a “method of offering a service according to Claim 5, wherein said data item in XML format defining said functionality is encoded in a second concrete part of the service description document”. Specifically, the metadata may contain data that identifies the particular client that issued a request, the device type of the client, the protocol supported by that client, the user currently using the client, the service requested by the client, and various parameters associated with the requested service (Lonnroth, col 9, ln 32-37).

Regarding Claim 7, Lonnroth discloses a “method of offering a service according to Claim 1, wherein the description of said functionality comprises a list of properties supported by said functionality, said properties defining at least respectively”(Lonnroth, col 8, ln 21-37). Furthermore, Lonnroth also discloses the style sheet for each device includes general instructions about how data should be formatted for he device (Lonnroth, col 8, ln 39-52).

Lonnroth discloses a “the node in the communication network adapted to execute said processing”. Specifically discloses a pre-processor and post- processor (col 4, ln 6-10).

Lonnroth discloses a “the type of processing”. Specifically discloses XML processing (col 6, ln 1-10).

Regarding Claim 8, Lonnroth discloses a “method of offering a service according to Claim 7, wherein said functionality also comprises a property adapted to

Art Unit: 4135

specify whether said processing is carried out on the sending or reception of said message". Specifically, the post-processor receives XML responses from the XML processor and a filtering unit selectively filters XL response documents based on filtering rules (Lonnroth, col 7, ln 40-50).

Regarding Claim 9, Lonnroth discloses a "method of offering a service according to Claim 7, wherein said functionality also comprises a property adapted to specify the message or a set of messages to which said processing applies". Specifically, XSL style sheets contain instructions about how each type of data item that can be contained in an XML document should be formatted prior to transmission to the client (Lonnroth, col 8, ln 20-25).

Regarding Claim 10, Lonnroth discloses a "method of offering a service according to Claim 7, wherein said functionality also comprises a property adapted to define the data produced or used by said processing, and possibly the type of said data". Specifically, XSL style sheets contain instructions about how each type of data item that can be contained in an XML document should be formatted prior to transmission to the client (Lonnroth, col 8, ln 20-25).

Regarding Claim 11, Lonnroth discloses a "method of offering a service according to Claim 7, wherein the description of said functionality comprises a property adapted to specify whether the processing to be carried out is obligatory or optional".

Art Unit: 4135

Specifically, upon receiving a service request, the pre-processor performs any operations that are required prior to servicing the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 22-25).

Regarding Claim 12, Lonnroth discloses a “method of offering a service according to Claim 7, wherein, for at least one property supported by said functionality, the description of said functionality comprises a list of values attributable to said property”. Specifically, in one embodiment, information about which services are authorized for each client are stored in a configuration database (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 28-30).

Regarding Claim 13, Lonnroth discloses a “method of testing access to a service by a client computer in a communication network, from a service description document”. Specifically, Lonnroth discloses a method and system for allowing an arbitrary client to be serviced by a single application is described (Lonnroth, col 3, ln 49-51).

Lonnroth also discloses a “extracting a description of a functionality implemented during a preprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the communication network”. Specifically, XML gateways are mechanisms for converting between XML and messages produced by other types of data sources (Lonnroth, col 6, ln 8-10).

Lonnroth also discloses a “reading the value associated with a property adapted to specify the node in the communication network adapted to execute the processing”.

Art Unit: 4135

Specifically, the XML gateways that are called by XML processor in response to a particular XML request document are XML gateways that are connected to the data sources have the information identified in the XML request document (Lonnroth, col 6, ln 26-35).

Lonnroth also discloses a “reading the value of a property adapted to specify whether the processing is obligatory or optional”. Specifically, upon receiving a service request, the pre-processor performs any operations that are required prior to servicing the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 22-25).

Lonnroth also discloses a “verifying whether the processing is supported by the client computer in the communication network when said processing is obligatory and must be executed by said client computer in the communication network”. Specifically, such operations may include, for example, performing security checks to determine whether the client issuing the request is authorized to issue the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 25-30).

Regarding Claim 14, Lonnroth discloses a “method of validating a message received by an intermediate computer in the communication network, from a service description document comprising a description of a functionality implemented during a reprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML format of the message exchanged during the execution of a service on the communication network”. Specifically, such operations may include, for example, performing security checks to determine whether

Art Unit: 4135

the client issuing the request is authorized to issue the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 25-30).

Lonnroth also discloses "extracting a processing from the message received". Specifically, the pre-processor generates based on the request and information contained in configuration database, a request object in the form of an XML document (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 31-35).

Lonnroth also discloses "acquiring at least one imperative value associated with a property of the processing". Specifically, the pre-processor generates based on the request and information contained in configuration database, a request object in the form of an XML document (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 31-35).

Lonnroth also discloses "verifying whether said imperative value is included in a list of values which can be attributed to a property supported by said functionality described in the service description document". Specifically, in one embodiment, information about which services are authorized for each client are stored in a configuration database (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 28-30).

Regarding Claim 15, Lonnroth also discloses "reading the value associated with a property adapted to specify whether the processing is executed before or after the sending of said message". Specifically, upon receiving a service request, the pre-processor performs any operations that are required prior to servicing the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 22-25).

Lonnroth also discloses "executing said processing when said value is adapted to specify that the processing must be executed before the sending of the message". Specifically, the post-processor receives XML responses from the XML processor and a filtering unit selectively filters XL response documents based on filtering rules (Lonnroth, col 7, ln 40-50).

Regarding Claim 16, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 1. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 1 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

Regarding Claim 17, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 13. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 13 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 13.

Regarding Claim 18, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 14. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 14 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 14.

Regarding Claim 19, Lonnroth also discloses "server computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of offering a service according to Claim 1" (Lonnroth, Fig 2: node 110, col 5, ln 18).

Regarding Claim 20, Lonroth also discloses a "client computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of testing access according to Claim 13" (Lonroth, col 4, ln 30).

Regarding Claim 21, Lonroth also discloses a "computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of validating a message according to Claim 14" (Lonroth, Fig 3, col 11, ln 7-8).

Regarding Claim 22, applicant claims a "computer program which can be read by a microprocessor, comprising portions of software code adapted to implement the method of offering a service according to Claim 1, when this computer program is loaded in and executed by the microprocessor". This claim is substantially similar to claim 1 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

Regarding Claim 23, applicant claims a "computer program which can be read by a microprocessor, comprising portions of software code adapted to implement the method of testing access according to Claim 13, when this computer program is loaded in and executed by the microprocessor". This claim is substantially similar to claim 13 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 13.

Regarding Claim 24, applicant claims a "computer program which can be read by a microprocessor, comprising portions of software code adapted to implement the

Art Unit: 4135

method of validating a message according to Claim 14, when this computer program is loaded in and executed by the microprocessor". This claim is substantially similar to claim 14 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 14.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Getchius et al., US 6,496,843: Generic Object Rapid Integration of Data Changes

Torii et al., US 7,073,120: Structured Document Transformation Method, Structured Document Transformation Apparatus, and Program Product

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashraf Zahr whose telephone number is (571) 270-1973. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs., 7:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frantz Coby can be reached on (571) 272-4017. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 4135

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AAZ
10/15/2007


FRANTZ COBY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER